UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Scuttling Neutrality - *Jesse M. MacKnight*

Bridging the Gulf—A Reply - - - - - - - - *George Richmond Grose*

Back to Geneva - - *O. A. Hammand*

Aerial Bombardment Versus Dropping of Handbills - - - - - - *S. C. Wu*

THE THREE WIZARDS
A Play—*by S. O. Levinson*

VOLUME CXXII NUMBER 6

Chicago, November 21, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 83
Jottings—J. H. H. 85

ARTICLES—
Scuttling Neutrality—JESSE M. MACKNIGHT 86
Bridging the Gulf—A Reply—GEORGE RICHMOND GROSE 90
Back to Geneva—O. A. HAMMAND 91
Aerial Bombardment Versus Dropping of Handbills—S. C. WU 93

PLAY—
The Three Wizards—S. O. LEVINSON 88

POETRY—
Realists—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 87

THE STUDY TABLE—
War-Made Pacifists—RICHARD B. GREGG 94
Bombs Bursting in Air—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 94
The Gospels Are Valid—C. A. HAWLEY 95

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Correction—FRANCIS H. ROWLEY 96
Jewish Refugees—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 96
The War Crisis in England—M. H. 96

THE FIELD—
A Religion of Evolution—*The Arbitrator* 82
Peace without Violence—*Bulletin of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom* 96

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Religion of Evolution

The universe was created and is controlled by a Vital Force which operates according to definite and consistent principles. Its revelations are continuous and cumulative.

From time immemorial right-minded people have sought to understand this Force and obey its laws. Primitive men conceived of it as a personal, anthropomorphic, supernatural God; faith in it was their Religion.

As science has resolved the supernatural into the natural, the Force has become impersonal; faith in it is Philosophy.

The variety of creation is beyond the mind of any one man to conceive, but men have classified practically everything in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms; their understanding of the Vital Force increases with each succeeding generation. There is greater knowledge of the cosmos now than has ever been possessed in the past.

People living today have available the accumulated wisdom of the ages. Modern man comprehends the operation of the Force better than any person, however inspired, who lived and wrote before the scientific era.

Inspiration can best be derived from the modern world. A more correct philosophy of life can be evolved by examining the universe as known in our time than by accepting the authority of any history, secular or sacred. The present is the most dependable period of revelation. Evolutionary Philosophy is founded upon constant laws rather than upon exceptions.

Scientific investigation having proved that creation has been gradual instead of direct, the doctrine of the fall of man gives place to the fact of his rise. Fortunately for mankind there is no present evidence of the existence of a vengeful God who has condemned unbelievers to everlasting damnation. Heaven has been swept from the heavens by astronomers; hell has been forever interred by geologists. No vicarious atonement is necessary for salvation.

Those who believe in the gradual growth of the universe and in the rise of man from the lower animals are Evolutionists. They view existing conditions as the epitome of creation. They earnestly endeavor to adjust their lives to the rules of the Vital Force as established by the experience of their forbears and themselves. They worship Truth and Progress.

Evolutionists believe that the greater man's knowledge of the world, the nearer will he approach Truth. Knowledge of the finite puts one in tune with the infinite. Not only have physical conditions improved but there has also been evolved a higher standard of ethics than prevailed in the days of man's ignorance. In retrospect the actions of the best mortals and divin-

(*Continued on page* 95)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXII MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1938 No. 6

NOW—AS THEN!

"The romantic view of war, of self-renunciation, of heroic sacrifices for noble ideals—which was exploited by the war directors, AS IT WILL AGAIN be exploited to lead men down the miry and bloody ways: that romantic view . . . lured many of the best Americans, who believed then (AS WE ARE ONCE MORE BEING TOLD) that to make war is justifiable because we are fighting for freedom, for democracy, for all kinds of abstractions that have not begun to be realized in any powerful community, and which will certainly be utterly destroyed by the iron discipline and unintelligent obedience of war. . . .

"I have never ceased to be amazed at the brazen way in which political leaders refuse to begin negotiations on the ground that the other side is not 'sincere,' and will aim at an advantage. It was so in the war, it has been so in the peace; and every time Germany or Italy or whatever may be the 'enemy' country proposes to talk, it is the statesmanlike thing to hint at the possibility of being 'cheated.' 'Democracy,' 'justice,' 'self-determination,' 'liberty'—these meaningless phrases . . . were employed to keep men in the trenches, AS THEY ARE BEING EMPLOYED TODAY to get them back; and we were then told, AS WE ARE TOLD TODAY, that the other side did not enjoy the benefits of 'democracy,' of 'justice,' of 'liberty,' as we did, and had some malignant design of reducing us to slavery. As if there was 'freedom,' 'democracy,' 'justice,' anywhere during war."

SIDNEY HUDDLESTON, in *In My Time* (Dutton), just published.

THE BEST AND THE WORST OF MUNICH

The discussion of what Chamberlain did or did not do at Munich still goes on. We have tried to study all viewpoints objectively, and find the gist of argument running along these lines: that the best that can be said of Chamberlain is that he prevented a war which might have marked the end of civilization, if not of our entire western world; that the worst that can be said of him is that he sold out Czechoslovakia in a deliberate conspiracy with Hitler to isolate and ultimately destroy Soviet Russia. This latter view, we may say, has been brilliantly expounded by Robert Dell in an article in the October 22nd issue of the *Nation,* in which this accomplished correspondent asserts that "the betrayal of Czechoslovakia is the result of a put-up job." Our opinion, after consideration and reconsideration, follows a somewhat middle ground. We still feel that Chamberlain's visit to Germany was a sublime gesture, destined to glow with immortal lustre; that he bargained wisely and beneficently for peace; but that in its actual terms he made a desperately poor, even perhaps disgraceful, bargain. He did right to purchase peace, but should have secured a better price. A Disraeli would have gone to Berchtesgaden and Godesberg and Munich, just as Chamberlain did, but would have wound Adolf Hitler around his little finger, and brought home his full share of the stakes. A Tallyrand would have remembered the old maxim that "the other fellow is as scared as you are," and made a stiff trade. Chamberlain had the right idea, the sublime intention, but proved weak and all too compliant in the actual carrying-out of his purpose. He should have secured concessions from Hitler to match his own! Nonetheless, we regard this as unimportant as compared with the actual achievement of keeping the peace. We repeat our fundamental conviction—a war postponed may be a war prevented. Chamberlain, in the last analysis, deserves well of mankind.

REFUGEES

Confusion still reigns in men's reactions on the Czechoslovakian settlement. The more satisfying is it, therefore, to find one matter upon which we can all agree—namely, succor for the refugees cast astray by the entrance of Hitler's armies into Sudeten territory. The cry of the refugees in Europe was pitiful enough before this latest tragedy, but these new voices give it added poignancy as well as volume. Sudeten land contained not merely Nazi Germans. It contained as well many thousands of Germans who had no desire to pass under the Nazi yoke, other thousands of Socialists, Communists, and political radicals generally, and still other thousands of peaceful Czechs and helpless Jews. Most of these fled their homes and abandoned their property when Hitler came marching in, fleeing desperately to Prague and surrounding Czech territory. Now Czechoslovakia, a remnant of its former self, crippled and distracted, is refusing to receive these refugees, and is driving them back into No Man's Land. The story of the two hundred Jews living in a ditch beside the new frontier is typical of unnumbered thousands of innocent and stricken folk. Now these must be helped—helped by all of us who have had convictions on this Czechoslovakian business. The warmakers must certainly help. They would have had us go to war to save Czechoslovakia, and thus sacrifice millions of men, women, and children, whom dead they would have had to bury, and starved and shelterless and wounded in the wake of armies they

would have had to keep alive. The least they can now do is to aid these victims of the peace, few in numbers as compared with the war-victims, but not less pitiful and appealing. The same thing applies to the pacifists —those of us who believe that Chamberlain chose the lesser of two evils, and saved civilization from extinction. We are glad that peace was preserved, but must recognize the dreadful price exacted of these fleeing multitudes in the stricken areas of Czechoslovakia. These, in a very particular sense, are England's victims and France's victims—the victims of us all who believe that what was done had to be done if Europe, perhaps even our whole western world, was to survive. So we must help, and in abundant measure.

LIKE THE INVENTION OF GUNPOWDER!

Walter Lippmann declares that the supremacy of the aeroplane as a new weapon of war marks a new era in the history of war such as that ushered in centuries ago by the invention and general use of gunpowder. From this point of view, he declares that historians will cite Berchtesgaden, Godesberg, and Munich as marking a turning-point in the evolution of civilization. At one stroke the best army in Europe, the French, and the greatest fleet in the world, the English, were rendered of no effect by the might, or even mere menace, of the German air force. If this be true, and it would seem to be, one wonders why the nations, in their feverish preparations for war, keep right on spending millions of dollars in maintaining armies and building navies. It takes two years to make a good soldier, three years to construct a first-class battleship, a few months to complete a bombing plane of the newest design. Why not abandon mass armies and scrap navies altogether, and focus all attention and labor upon building not hundreds but thousands of the most potent aeroplanes that designers can perfect? That is just what happened when gunpowder came along and made useless the heavy armor and swords and spears of the medieval knights. These knights simply doffed their armor and grabbed a gun—and the face of the world was changed! But perhaps the bombing plane is destined to achieve even more revolutionary results! It may be remembered that Colonel Lindbergh has said that the plane "will outlaw war." Dorothy Thompson has taken up this statement in a recent newspaper article and argued that bombing from the skies has suddenly rendered nations defenseless in the event of war. Hitherto it has been possible to defend frontiers, and win a war by destroying the enemy's armed forces. Now the bombing plane can leap frontiers, destroy cities and transportation systems, and decimate whole populations. Germany lost the last war, but kept her territory inviolate. But this cannot be done again! War perhaps is getting too terrible to be thought of, much less used. Who knows—through the sheer insanity of our war-machines, peace may be nearer than we realize!

NOT NAZI-LAND YET!

The state of New Jersey has been disquieting. Ruled by the notorious Mayor Hague after the best pattern of Hitler's rule in Germany, it has seemed of late as though every attempt to introduce democracy were as impossible as in the Reich itself. Months ago free speech was denied in Jersey to anybody and everybody whom Hague did not chance to like. Meetings were denied or broken up, speakers assaulted, beaten up and "deported," protesters arrested on trumped-up charges and thrust in jail. It was a horrible situation —and apparently there was no remedy. The courts were useless, as Hague owns his judges. The administration in Washington, of which Hague is one of the proudest defenders as a member of the Democratic National Committee, made some feeble attempt at investigation, but nothing came of it, and the recent campaign saw cabinet officers and other party satellites rushing to the support of the Hague machine. But now has come a federal court, altogether outside the control of the "Boss," to make New Jersey once again a part of this democratic republic. In a sweeping decision handed down by Mr. Justice Clark in answer to appeals from the C. I. O. and the American Civil Liberties Union, Mayor Hague and his police are permanently enjoined from interfering with the rights of citizens to speak in public places, to hold public meetings, to distribute leaflets and pamphlets, in general to conduct agitation. "Deportation," the thrusting of unwelcome visitors over the borders of the city, is expressly forbidden. The Hague gang must leave the people alone in the exercise of their constitutional rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly. The decision is complete. America is herself again! Over such a victory we may well celebrate. And in the celebration let it be remembered that courts and judges have their indispensable uses in this country—among other things, in interfering with the executive!

TRUTH AND THE COMMUNISTS

In Commonwealth College, Arkansas, is a brave man, Claude Williams, who has long been active in the work of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. Williams has been furiously attacked as a Communist, and charged with dominating the Union, as a member of its Executive Committee, in the interest of the Communists. The President of the Union, J. R. Butler, has defended Claude Williams through thick and thin, since he had Claude Williams' word that he had no connection of any kind with the Communist Party. Some weeks ago, inadvertently and carelessly, Williams left some papers on Butler's desk. Among these papers was a Communist Party document, issued for

members only, boasting of Williams' "undercover work" in the Tenant Farmers Union. Butler is now openly charging that the Communist Party, through Williams, has been secretly trying to capture the Union. All this is a beautiful illustration of what we are up against in any endeavor to do business with the Communists. With the best will in the world, in the determination to deal in as fair and friendly a way with Communists as with other people, what are we going to do when Communists simply refuse to recognize the ethical code which holds society together? To lie, to deceive, to cheat, to steal, to betray, all this is perfectly all right in Communist eyes, if done in the interest of Communism, since morality is a mere bourgeois superstition. Here is John Strachey, the English radical, shut out of this country because he is charged with being a Communist and thus inadmissible under the law. A lot of us think that to exclude Strachey from our shores is ridiculous—and we have Strachey's word for it that he is not a member of the Party. But what is his word worth if he *is* a member of the Party? Nothing at all! As a Communist it would be his duty to lie, in order to circumvent a capitalist government. Hence our helplessness in this whole regrettable situation! Something happens when decencies between men are lost—when basic moral standards are thrown overboard in party interest. Chaos has long prevailed in the international world because the word of nations cannot be trusted. Is the same chaos to spread into the social world because the word of individuals cannot be trusted? We refer questioners to Richard C. Cabot's book, *Honesty,* for enlightenment.

THE RADIO SCARE

The radio scare precipitated by the broadcasting of H. G. Wells' *The War of the Worlds* was illuminating. It revealed many things. It showed, for example, the credulity of the public mind. The broadcast was full of references to Martians, "death rays" and other extravagant material from Wells' fantasy, and yet hundreds of thousands of listeners evidently swallowed the whole thing as a real event. And we marvel that "phoney" advertising, "fake" cures, political panaceas, and religious rhodomontade deceive and mislead its millions of gullible human beings! It is just this incredible credulity which is played upon with such dire results by wartime propaganda. The great masses of the people will believe anything—the more horrible the better! Another revelation of this fantastic broadcast was the jittery state of the public nerves. Have we realized to what an extent we are living these days right on the edge of hysteria? A little shove—and instantly we topple into the pit of panic. The steady, unremitting pressure, in other words, of "wars and rumors of wars," of bombardments, massacres and endless death, is registering its effect upon nerves which are more taut than we have known. A whole population straightway "goes to pieces" over a make-believe end-of-the-world on a radio broadcast. Obviously, we are reaching the end of our psychological reserves. A final and ominous significance of this event is found in the question—what if this had been real? What if this broadcast had been an account of a genuine attack of enemy air raiders upon our cities? We have all of us read dramatic stories—from Spain and elsewhere—of how heroically civilian populations sustain bombardments from the skies. They are not frightened, we are told, but only angry! Mr. John Langdon-Davies, in his new book, *Air Raid,* based on Spanish experience, says this is not true. Barcelona was paralyzed by the panic terror of its people when Franco's bombers dropped their loads! Now we see, in this silly radio episode, that of course it is not true. An air attack instantly and completely demoralizes a non-combatant population. Incidentally, we may now guess, perhaps, what happened in Europe in the Czechoslovakian crisis.

Jottings

Mussolini is a teetotaler, never smokes, and eats little meat. Hitler is a teetotaler, never smokes, and eats no meat. Almost are we persuaded to become a "soak," smoke cigarettes by the carload, and eat nothing but meat raw!

Hitler won his Austerlitz in Austria, and his Tilsit at Munich. How long will it take him to come to Moscow, and at last face Waterloo?

One of the most successful plays in New York last year was a savage attack on the Oxford Group Movement. This year has brought a play which is an even more ruthless attack upon Christian Science. What does this portend—a raid right down the line against religion?

The late Sir Austin Chamberlain wrote a book entitled, *Peace in Our Time.* We wonder if his brother, Neville, the British Prime Minister, got his idea from this book.

Mark Twain once said that when he got to heaven, he was going to use his influence to have the human race drowned again—and see to it that this time there would be no foolish Noah and his Ark. Had Mark Twain been living today, he would not have worried. The human race is preparing so fast to destroy itself that no flood is needed. War will do the trick!

A recent newspaper report of a community festival in New York records, as though in amazement, that "children of Czechoslovakian and German families danced merrily together." Well, why not? Children don't know or care anything about these nationalistic quarrels. Children have to be carefully trained to hate each other. That is one reason, perhaps, why Jesus said something about "Except ye become as little children. . . ."!

J. H. H.

Scuttling Neutrality

JESSE M. MACKNIGHT

When the Administration's Senate spokesman on foreign affairs tells the newspapers that the neutrality law will be rewritten, it is time to take notice of recent developments. Senator Key Pittman (D., Nev.), Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a statement to the press on July 9, claimed that a year of war in China had demonstrated that the President must be granted "wider discretion" in our economic and commercial dealings with warring nations. He also said that the Administration would present to the next Congress "suggestions" for such a change in the neutrality law.

To the average newspaper reader, the Pittman statement was just another news story. To those who have watched developments in Washington during the last twelve months, it was a warning of what will come in the 76th Congress which meets on January third, next year. The remarks of the Administration leader were part of the "campaign of education" through which the President and the State Department have been seeking the backing of the American people in an effort to scuttle neutrality. As an alternative to a real neutrality law, the Administration proposes giving the President the power to choose the side with which Americans can trade in the event of war abroad. This means, in effect, supporting one belligerent against another. If history teaches anything, this means the risk, if not the certainty, of war. Anthony Eden gave testimony of this in a speech earlier this year.

To avoid this pitfall, which helped in large measure to take the United States into the World War, the neutrality law was first adopted, over the vigorous opposition of the Administration, in 1935. The neutrality program does not offer complete protection against war. Even its most optimistic sponsors admit that. It does, however, prevent any administration in power from following the financial and economic path of 1914-1917 when the lack of such legislation allowed the development of a huge trade stake in the success of the Allies. The legislation also seeks to curb the warmaking powers of the President by preventing him from choosing sides. This latter point should not be lost sight of because executive control of foreign policy today means giving to one man the power to commit the country to war and to establish a domestic dictatorship under the control of the military. Plans for such a dictatorship are already in the files of the War Department. The Sheppard-May Bill which embodied the major points in the War Department's Industrial Mobilization Plan was sidetracked in the last Congress only by a narrow margin.

The present neutrality law was adopted on April 29, 1937, as permanent legislation, only one section having a two-year limit. It was the third bill to be adopted in an effort to revise the neutrality policy of the United States in such a way as to protect this country against the danger of entanglement in foreign wars. The original law adopted in August, 1935, expired the following February. The second law was also adopted as temporary legislation, ending on May 1, 1937.

Each law has marked a step toward a policy clearly defined by Congress, designed to prevent the entanglement of this country in foreign wars. All three laws have marked a compromise between the Congressional demand for mandatory legislation and the Administration demand for discretionary legislation. In each law, the mandatory provisions were strengthened and increased. This trend reflected a steadily increasing pressure from the people against American participation in foreign wars.

By 1935, disclosures by the Nye Committee and studies by historians as to the situation in this country in the period just before our entrance into the World War led to a demand in Congress for a revision of our traditional neutrality policy. The demand gained strength in the closing days of the 1935 Congressional session. The President refused, however, to put the question on his "must" program. A group of determined Congressmen led by Maury Maverick of Texas refused to take "no" for an answer. By threatening to filibuster and prevent adjournment, they obtained action.

In general, the President and the State Department desired to retain complete power for themselves by means of a discretionary neutrality law, leaving it to the President to decide whether embargoes should be applied and if applied whether they should be against one or both sides in a conflict. The Congressional group, on the other hand, demanded that the embargoes be placed on all belligerents when war broke out.

The 1935 law, as enacted, prohibited the sale of munitions to those nations at war when a state of war was declared to exist by the President; prohibited American vessels from carrying munitions destined for belligerents; and gave the President power to prohibit travel by American citizens on the vessels of belligerents, and control over the use of our ports by the submarines of a foreign nation in wartime. The law also provided for the establishment of a Munitions Control Board in the State Department, giving the government licensing power over exports of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. The Board, which was con-

tinued in subsequent legislation, is required to publish an annual report of all licenses issued.

When it came time to renew the law which expired on February 29, 1936, the Administration submitted to Congress a bill embodying the principle of mandatory embargoes on all parties engaged in war. The proposed bill continued the main provisions of the 1935 law and extended it to include a prohibition on the extension of loans or credits to warring nations. Also proposed was the granting of power to the President to place restrictions on the export of certain articles or materials, except food or medical supplies, in addition to munitions of war. A list of such materials was to be selected by the President. Materials included in the list could not be exported in excess of a "normal quota" which was to be determined by the President. The war materials list could be added to, modified or revoked by the President.

At the last minute, the Administration threw overboard the proposed bill, and the all-important question of controlling the export of war materials in addition to munitions was left untouched. The tremendous boom in American exports of scrap iron and steel, copper, gasoline, and other necessary secondary materials of war during 1936, 1937, and 1938 when the nations of the world, especially Japan, were stocking their shelves with war supplies, is adequate proof that the question should have been settled at the time of the 1936 revision of the neutrality legislation.

As finally approved, the 1936 revision continued the provisions of the 1935 law and added to them a ban on the extension of loans or credits to belligerent nations. It also provided that the law should not apply to an American republic or republics engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided that the American republic is not coöperating with a non-American state or states in such war. The 1936 law was also temporary legislation and expired on May 1, 1937.

The present law, as revised in 1937, in addition to imposing a mandatory embargo upon munitions and loans and credits, and prohibition on American ships carrying arms to belligerents, prohibits travel by American citizens on belligerent vessels, prohibits the arming of American merchant vessels, and gives the President power to require the transfer of title in all or any goods shipped to belligerents provided such provision applies to all nations engaged in war. The President may also list goods which American ships may not carry to belligerents. These two discretionary provisions for control of trade were adopted for a two-year period only. The law also gave the President power to restrict the use of our ports in wartime by foreign armed merchant vessels as well as submarines. The law applies to civil strife in the same general manner as in the case of international war. The exception of the American republics from the working of the act was continued with the same provisions as in the 1936 law. An effort was made in the present law to make its application automatic by providing that it should come into effect whenever "the President shall find a state of war exists."

The present law does not provide any means of stopping the sale of war materials other than munitions to belligerents so long as they can pay cash. It therefore leaves the way open for a war boom in this country, since foreigners now hold several billion dollars worth of American securities which could be converted into cash almost overnight. The law also does not keep our ships out of war zones, nor does it prevent the misuse of the American flag by belligerent ships in wartime. Still more important is the lack of any control over the arms trade during the period in which the nations are preparing for war. This has allowed the development of a tremendous export trade in arms ammunition and implements of war during peacetime. An illustration of this trade is the recently placed British order of $25,000,000 worth of American aircraft.

The "campaign of education" to get support for the Administration's program of exclusive executive control of neutrality will be intensified during the remainder of this year. The Pittman story is a warning. The American people must keep a clear head in this situation. The Administration's efforts will be cloaked in moral phrases and heroic sentiments. They have been garbed in that fashion for some months. There have been many statements by Administration spokesmen about "law and order," the "sanctity of treaties," the "peace-loving democracies," and "American rights and interests" which must be protected. Behind each of these slogans stands the Administration's program which in its simplest terms means—"Scuttle neutrality in favor of choosing sides."

If the American people want to keep out of war abroad, they must make their voice heard in the months to come. *Every member of the Congress should be asked where he stands on this vital issue.* The President and the Secretary of State should also be told by letter *now* what the people want. The choice of neutrality or trade with one side in the event of war abroad will be made by the 76th Congress.

Let the American people reflect on two sentences from a speech of the President, delivered at Chautauqua, New York, on August 14, 1936. On that occasion the President said:

> Nevertheless, if war should break out again on another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches — fools' gold — would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

At another point, he said:

> But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer, and the positive support of the American people. . . .

Realists

(Dedicated to the Statesmen of Europe)

They see but solid things like swords and dollars,
And scorn abstractions like their neighbors' rights;
Let freedom's neck be penned in iron collars,
And courage die, while prudence dims all lights.

Honor to them is but a monkey leering,
And faith a bird to throttle in mid-air.
But when they see a wolf, with red lips sneering,
They serve up lambs to grace his bill of fare.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

The Three Wizards*

S. O. LEVINSON

First Wizard: Clemenceau
Second Wizard: Lloyd George
Third Wizard: Wilson

Scene 1

A Place of Open Diplomacy.

Sound of unlocking doors. Enter the Three Wizards.

1st Wiz.: When shall we three meet again
To make a treaty clear and plain?
2d Wiz.: When the hurly-burly's done,
When the Japs have got Shantung.
3d Wiz.: That will be ere set of sun.
1st Wiz.: Where the place?
2d Wiz.: The Hall of Mirrors.
3d Wiz.: There to sanctify our errors.
2d Wiz.: I come, graymalkin.
3d Wiz.: The Senate calls. Anon!
All: Fair is foul and foul is fair
In the treaty drawn up there.

Scene 2

The Council Chamber.

Enter on tiptoes the Three Wizards.

3d Wiz.: Where has thou been, brother?
1st Wiz.: Holding the Liberals in leash.
2d Wiz.: Brother, where thou?
3d Wiz.: We had a senate and a constitution once,
Which I munched and munched and munched.
"Give me a League," quoth I.
"Aroint thee, wizard. First divide the world,
Then have the flag of peace unfurled."
And when I leave France and my master the "Tiger,"
With my league I'll thither sail,
And though I know not head nor tail,
I'll do, I'll do, I'll do.
1st Wiz.: I'll give thee a secret treaty signed.
3d Wiz.: Thou art kind.
2d Wiz.: And I another.
3d Wiz.: I myself have all the other:
Though my fourteen points are lost,
Their use was cheap at any cost.
I will drain the Senate dry.
And however they defy,
I will force it down their throat:
I have ways to make them vote.
Weary interviews nine times nine,
Then they'll dwindle, peak and pine.
Though they once had some prestige,
They'll acknowledge me their liege.
Look what I have.
1st Wiz.: Show me, show me!
3d Wiz.: Words to make them see the light,
Though we work in darkest night.
(Whispers within.)
2d Wiz.: A drum! a drum!
The Jap doth come.
All: The weird brothers hand in glove,
Bringing in eternal love,
Thus abolish wars forever.
Take the League and quickly sign;
Then the lands I grabbed are mine.
Peace! the charm's wound up.

Enter the U. S. Senate and the U. S. People.

People: So foul a treaty I have never seen.
Sen.: How is this called "The Peace?" What are these
So royal and majestic in attire?
Live you, or are you aught
That man may question?
People: Speak if you can: what are you?
1st Wiz.: All hail, O League! Hail to thee, League of Nations!
2d Wiz.: All hail, O League! Hail to thee, Peace Eternal!
3d Wiz.: All hail, O League! Hail to thee, O Millennium!
Sen.: Good People, why do you start, and seem to fear
Things that do sound so fair? In the name of truth
Is it fantastical, or that indeed
Which outwardly it shows? The noble diplomats
You greet with sounding phrase; to me ye speak not.
If you can look into the seeds of time
And say which wars will come and which will not,
Speak then to me, who neither beg nor fear
Your favors nor your hate.
1st Wiz.: Sign!
2d Wiz.: Sign!
3d Wiz.: Sign!

The Three Wizards shove the Senate and People out and slam the doors.

Scene 3

The Inner Shrine.

In the middle a boiling cauldron, labeled "Peace."

1st Wiz.: Thrice a week have we conspired.
2d Wiz.: Argued here till we are tired.
3d Wiz.: His Lordship cries, "'Tis time, 'tis time!"
1st Wiz.: To work upon the treaty go;
In the poisoned sections throw:
Add America's guaranties;
Forget the freedom of the seas;
Bitter venom and intrigue
Put thou in the damnéd League.
All: Double, double, toil and trouble,
See the war and hatred bubble.
2d Wiz.: Secret treaties, robber pacts.
All our old disgraceful acts;
Empires swapped and peoples traded,
Half of Russia close blockaded;
All the Balkan crazy quilt
Plunged in bloodshed, stained in guilt.
For a charm of powerful trouble
Like a hell-broth boil and bubble.
All: Double, double, toil and trouble,
See the war and hatred bubble.

*Mr. Levinson, with the assistance of Mr. T. H. Banks, Jr., wrote *The Three Wizards* in 1919. Post-war events have amply justified Mr. Levinson's predictions.—*Editors.*

3d Wiz.: Everywhere our voice has thundered:
Teuton crushed and China plundered;
Pogroms of blaspheming Jew
By our allies tried and true;
Dismembered Turk and Tartar plains,
England, France and Italy's gains;
Chile, Hedjaz and Liberia,
Siam, Honduras and Siberia,
In mock sovereignty arrayed
By this League that we have made:
Add the "Tiger's" double portion
To this terrible abortion.

All: Double, double, toil and trouble,
See the war and hatred bubble.

1st Wiz.: Cool it with the nation's blood;
Then the League is firm and good.

Enter the Spirit of Old Diplomacy.

Old D.: O well done! I commend your pains;
And every one shall share i' the gains;
And now about the treaty raise
Your camouflage of windy praise
Disguising all your shifty ways.

(Faint shouts of "Black Spirits," etc. Old Diplomacy retires.)

3d Wiz.: By the pricking in my thumbs,
Something wicked this way comes;
Open pacts—
Without the facts!

Enter the Senate.

Sen.: How, now, you secret black and midnight wags! What is't you do?

All: A deed without a name.

Sen.: I conjure you, by that which you profess
Howe'er you come to know it, answer me:
Though you unleash the Poles and let them fight
Against the Slavs; although your frothy words
Confound and swallow navigation up;
Although complaints be Lodged and Knocks incurred,
Though palaces and chancellories do slope
Their heads to their foundations; though the treasure
Of ruthless Germans tumble altogether,
Even till destruction sicken: answer me
To what I ask you.

1st Wiz.: Speak.

2d Wiz.: Demand.

3d Wiz.: We will lay all our information openly before you.

1st Wiz.: Say, if thou'dst rather hear it from our mouths,
Or from our masters in the saddle?

Sen.: Call 'em. Let me see 'em.

Thunder. First Apparition: Confucius.

Sen.: Tell me, thou mighty man—

2d Wiz.: He knows thy thought:
Hear his speech but say thou naught.
The secret of our power is secrecy.

Confucius: O Senate! Senate! Senate! Protect my native land;
Beware the wily Jap. Dismiss me. Enough.

(Descends.)

Sen.: Whate'er thou art, for thy good caution, thanks;
Thou hast harped my fear aright; but one word more—

3d Wiz.: He will not be commanded: here's another
More potent than the first.

Thunder. Second Apparition: A Texas Magician.

T. M.: O Chief! Chief! Chief!

3d Wiz.: Had I three ears, I'd hear thee.

T. M.: Be bloody, bold and resolute and laugh to scorn
The Senate's power, for none of woman born
Shall harm the League.

(Descends.)

3d Wiz.: Then talk, O Senate: what need I fear of thee?
But yet I'll make assurance double sure,
And take a bond of fate: thou shalt not talk;
That I may tell pale-hearted fear it lies,
And sleep in spite of thunder.

Thunder. Third Apparition: A man-child crowned, with a sceptre in his hand.

Sen.: What is this
That rises like the issue of a king,
And wears on his professor's brow the round
And top of sovereignty?

All: Listen, but speak not to it.

3rd App.: Be lion-mettled, proud and take no care
Who chafes, who frets, or where objectors are:
The League shall never vanquished be until
Great Woodrow's autocratic quill
Shall recognize the public will.

(Descends.)

3d Wiz.: That will never be:
How can the public influence me?
Unfix my rock-bound will? Sweet bodements, good!
Rebellion's head rise never! If it should
Rise in the Senate, my low-spoke command
Will keep the Southern Senators in hand
By my time-honored custom.

Sen.: Yet my heart
Throbs to know one thing: Tell me, if your art
Can do so: shall this treaty's issue ever
Reign in this our fair and peaceful land?
And shall our independence stand
Free from the Council's binding hand?

All: Seek to know no more.

Sen.: I will be satisfied: deny me this,
And an eternal curse fall on you! Let me know
Why sinks that cauldron and what noise is this?

(Cannon.)

1st Wiz.: Show!

2d Wiz.: Show!

3d Wiz.: Show!

All: Show his eyes and grieve his heart;
Come like shadows, so depart!

A Show of Eight Wars, the last with a glass in his hand, Machiavelli following.

Sen.: Thou art too like the spirit of conflict: Down!
Thy swords do sear mine eye-balls, and thy shape,
Thou other bloody war, is like the first.
A third is like the former: filthy wags!
Why do you show me this? A fourth! Start, eyes!
What, will the line stretch out to the crack of doom?
Another yet! a seventh! I'll see no more:
And yet the eighth appears, who bears a glass
Which shows me many more: and some I see
That two-fold cannon, treble horrors furnish:
Horrible sight! Now I see 'tis true;
For Machiavelli smiles upon me
And points at them for his. What! is this so?

3d Wiz.: Ay, sir, all this is so: but why
Stand you thus amazedly?
Come brothers, cheer we up his sprités
And show him all the League's delights:
I'll charm the air to give a sound
That the millennium is found;
That this poor fool be led astray,
And give our greatest prize away.

(The Wizards Vanish.)

Sen.: Where are they? Gone? Let this pernicious hour
Stand aye accursed in the calendar
If I should ratify.

[FINIS.]

Bridging the Gulf—A Reply

GEORGE RICHMOND GROSE

"Bridging the Gulf Between Judaism and Christianity" is the title of a recent article in UNITY by Karl M. Chworowsky. The frankness and honesty of the writer in describing the separateness of these two great religious faiths and his trenchant criticism of the attitude of Christians toward Jews are indicative of the increasing interest in better mutual understanding of Jews and Christians.

The purpose of this article is to treat with equal candor and forthrightness the problem of Jewish-Christian relations, also to point out the writer's exaggeration of the barriers to closer fellowship.

Mr. Chworowsky's contention, that the recurrence of Jewish persecution and of vicious anti-Semitism in Germany, Poland, and Italy is due to "something in the very psychology and temperament of Christian nations and peoples that makes possible in Christian lands these periodic outbursts of Jew-hatred," is not well-founded. While Germany and Italy are nominally Christian nations, the persecution of Jews in Germany has been incited and instrumented by an avowed anti-religionist whose political ideology and philosophy of life are thoroughly and unblushingly pagan.

The Pope, head of the great body of Catholic Christians in Italy, has outspokenly condemned the extravagant nationalism and racial discrimination of Fascism. The fact of the brutal persecution of Jews in Germany and Austria can no more properly be chargeable to Christian psychology and temperament than the lynching of Negroes can be charged to the genius of American democracy.

Further, the European outburst of anti-Semitism is not, as Mr. Chworowsky avers, "incontrovertible evidence that the old gulf between Jews and Christians still exists, and that our bridges have either failed to reach across the abyss or have been washed away." The latest outrages against the Jews only evidence the fact that there are pagan forces running wild in the world and the Jew is the victim of their selfish designs.

Germany is seeking revenge for wrongs which in the eyes of a fanatical megalomaniac have become colossal and must be punished. The guilty persons are really the English, the French, the Americans, but for the time being they are out of reach; but the Jews are in Germany and are helpless, and easily available as scapegoats. Therefore with a furious dash of humbug Hitler releases upon them the nation's subterranean desires.

Mr. Chworowsky points to the "cynical sadism of European tyrants toward Jewish minorities," to the diatribes of Father Coughlin, and to the fanatical antics of a Kansas clergyman, as further evidence of the existing chasm between Jews and Christians.

Every self-respecting Christian hangs his head in humiliation over these exhibitions of fanaticism and intolerance. But we should remember that the persecution of the Jews in Germany is not sponsored by German Catholics or Protestants, that the Detroit priest does not speak for the American Catholic Church, and that the Kansas cleric was openly and strongly censured by the united Christian forces of Kansas.

I accept unhesitatingly the challenge of Mr. Chworowsky, calling upon Christians to repent and take the first steps toward a better understanding between Jews and Christians. There is no rightful place for "an attitude of condescension" or of assumed superiority on the part of Christians toward Jews. I confess humbly and sincerely for my fellow-Christians the wrongs which the Jews have suffered through the centuries.

But we must remember that Jews and Christians cannot be brought into closer fellowship by an attitude of superiority on either side. Mr. Chworowsky frankly argues for the superiority of Judaism to Christianity from the point of view of doctrine, ethics, spiritual insight, and human attitude. The balancing of the claims of one faith against the other does not advance real understanding and religious fellowship. The Jew would not be an honest Jew if he did not believe in the superior claims of Judaism. And by the same token, the Christian would not be an honest Christian if he did not believe in the superior claims of Christianity. But the sincere Jew and the sincere Christian can hold tenaciously, each to his distinctive belief, and still respect and honor and fraternize with his brother of the other faith.

In the interest of religious togetherness, we want no mongrel type, or milk-and-water brand of Jew or Christian. Let the Jew be a Jew, without apology or defense; let the Christian be a Christian unashamed of his faith; and let each recognize that beneath all differences in doctrines, in ceremonies of worship, and in religious emphases, there is a basic unity—conceptual, ethical, spiritual, social—which binds us together in a divine brotherhood.

Mr. Chworowsky complains of the missionary activities of Christians in trying to make converts to their faith. It must be frankly granted that the missionary zeal of Christians has not always been tempered with knowledge and consideration. This is nonetheless true of the Christian approach to Buddhists, Hindus, and people of other faiths. But it must not be forgotten that the spiritual genius of Judaism as well as Christianity is essentially missionary. Judaism at the height of its power and influence was to be "a light to the gentiles," and all the nations were to flow to Jerusalem for spiritual instruction and leading. Its deepest impulse is to share with all men the blessings of God's truth and love. Vital Judaism and vital Christianity are both alike missionary in impulse and endeavor, not seeking to proselyte, but to share with all men irrespective of race or nation the riches of God's grace.

Religious conviction easily degenerates into fanaticism, and fanaticism into intolerance and persecution. But true missionary zeal does not imply a sense of religious superiority, or an attitude of condescension, but rather a yearning to share with others the spiritual gifts of our faith.

In spite of the blundering approach of many Christians in missionary efforts, the centuries of missionary activity since Paul do not mean that Jews or other non-Christian races or cultures are regarded as inferior. It means that whatever of good and truth there is in Christianity, or in Judaism, should be shared with others. If we regard Judaism and Christianity as the finest flowers of the faith of mankind, they are the fulfillment of other faiths. The claim of the Great Galilean —always a Jew—that he "came not to destroy, but to fulfill" Judaism, is the very essence of religious tolerance. The more intelligently one discerns the spiritual value of his own faith in the satisfaction and enrichment of life, the more earnestly will he seek to extend its benefits to others, and always in the conviction that all men are the sons of God the Father.

How can the wall of separation between Jews and Christians be broken down? By looking for our major agreements instead of minor differences. In the basic essentials of religious belief and practice, Judaism and Christianity are one. They have a common tradition, a common heritage in theistic belief, a common objective in setting up the kingdom of heaven in the earth, a common source of strength and hope in the presence of the living God.

They have also a common enemy—the world whose power is now embodied in a pagan god who defies truth and right, justice and humanity. The call of the hour is for all who believe in truth and goodness to join in wholehearted endeavor to bring in the kingdom of God. And in this common purpose and effort, Jews and Christians will discover their spiritual kinship, and will hold their differences in particular convictions, in mores, and in manners, always in mutual respect and in the bonds of peace and love.

I refuse to believe that there is a great gulf between Jews and Christians. If we meet one another in an attitude of level-eyed respect and mutual tolerance, with a will to live together in the spirit and service of God, the barriers which separate us will be removed. No chasm divides Jews and Christians. We agree to differ; we resolve to love.

Back to Geneva

O. A. HAMMAND

Millions of men backed up behind the Siegfried line; millions of men backed up behind the Maginot line; Germany in general mobilization and France in general mobilization with everyone expecting war—but this is just a part of the picture. The British Navy takes out to sea with an undisclosed destination; thousands of Russian airplanes stand ready to take off; and Mussolini, temporarily forgotten, surges forward with the announcement that Italy is a great, warlike nation and that her place is already chosen.

And why all this? Germany, with perhaps the support of two or three more nations, had decided to seize a part of Czechoslovakia, or, if there were not too much resistance, all of it. But big resistance developed. Czechoslovakia got ready to fight. She put up cement walls on her borders, and back of them barricades of posts and barbed wire. Back of that she put her big guns and then her anti-aircraft guns and small guns, and behind them all, soldiers, line after line. She had decided to fight, and France, under a treaty of assistance, was supposed to help her. If France fought, it was certain that England and Russia would fight.

Spain, in her internecine struggle, paused to glance at the greater and more terrible impending calamity, and Italian and German soldiers were pulled back out of the ranks and hurried home. China and Japan took a swift, furtive look towards the West; Canada was ready for "trouble" and the United States went into jitters. How did this come about? America stands for isolation. "Keep our nose out of other people's affairs. . . Let Europe stew in its own juice." But the time had come when millions of American mothers feared for the lives of their sons and millions of American fathers frankly acknowledged that they did not know what to do.

This threatened blight to our civilization did not arise in a minute or without our knowledge. It had been developing for a long time and this country paid no attention to it. Only a few years back, Hitler was just a paper hanger and was once in jail. He was unknown up to 1930, that being the first time his name appeared in the year book. But he started his campaign of propaganda against the "abuses, insults, and indignities" to which the Germans were subjected, and after seven elections was regularly elected Supreme Chancellor. Within a few days Hindenburg died and Hitler succeeded to the presidency, and then in a forced plebiscite he was elected Dictator. After a rapid rise

to power, there was no place to stop and no desire to stop.

He cracked down on the Christian Church and on the Jews and all liberals within his country. He took away their property and their jobs; put them in jail or concentration camps, and never hesitated at murder when it suited his purpose. He built up his army, navy, and air force; harangued them from a balcony; and all the time talked war. He moved his armies into the demilitarized Rhineland; Dollfuss was assassinated; Austria was swallowed up; and Schuschnigg is supposed to be in jail.

Next there came the demands against Czechoslovakia and the threat to take the Sudeten lands by force. This threat of war threw the whole of Europe into a state of fear, and Chamberlain, Premier of the mighty British Empire, asked for another twenty-four hours. As the democracies yielded, Hitler made larger and more peremptory demands. The more he got, the more he wanted. He put up time limits and declared that his armies would march. His program was based on the pretense of protecting the German minorities, which were never a part of the German nation and had been outside its boundaries for two hundred years.

But there were some substantial reasons for his rabble-rousing program. "They have defeated us and disarmed us and promised to disarm themselves, and then refused to do it. . . Instead of disarming as they agreed to do in the Treaty of Versailles, they have increased their armies and navies and air force." Now, all of these things were true; and besides, America led the procession in appropriations for army and navy. We demanded naval parity with England and got it, but when Japan wanted naval parity with us, we refused it. We were not interested in reduction of arms except on the basis of retaining a superior force.

Go back just a little further. In May, 1918, President Wilson sent a message to Congress suggesting fourteen points as a possible basis for ending the war. After five months his plan was accepted and the peace delegates met at the Palace of Versailles, just outside of Paris. But the delegates were all in a bitter and selfish frame of mind. Italy wanted the Dalmatian Coast; Japan wanted Shantung; France wanted to dismember Germany. "Have I not seen German soldiers invade French territory twice in my lifetime? . . . I will never move our French soldiers out of Germany until I have security for France. . . . I demand security for France." One man from England thought that the most important thing was to hang the Kaiser. But none of these things was permitted as they were contrary to Wilson's fourteen points.

"What assurance do I have that Germany will not again invade France?"

"The League of Nations is your assurance."

"But what if the League does not work? How do I know that the League will work?"

"With fifty-six nations back of it, all bound to support it and defend any country against an aggressor nation, it cannot help but work."

"But who will defend France until the League is organized and a going concern and strong enough to control an international situation?"

"The great democracies will do it. England and America will sign a separate treaty guaranteeing France against invasion from Germany to be in effect until the League is able to protect international boundaries."

"All right. With that separate treaty signed by France, England, and the United States agreeing to guarantee the boundaries of France, I will bring my armies back out of Germany."

This treaty was signed by the representatives of all three nations, and France withdrew her armies and accepted the League.

But what was going on back in the United States? A few reactionary senators were organizing a Round Robin to get signatures to oppose Wilson's League of Nations no matter what it might be. They wanted to put Wilson "in the hole" and they succeeded in putting him in the grave. They fought the League when it came up for ratification in the Senate, and although it still had a majority of the votes, it did not have the two-thirds necessary to pass. So America knocked the cornerstone out from under the League of Nations and ruined the first effort to organize the world on a basis of law and law-enforcement.

When the Treaty of Versailles, including the Covenant of the League, was turned down, the other treaty of assistance to France was never submitted to the Senate, so the second American agreement was broken off short and France was let down and left to her own devices. Therefore, of course she refused to disarm. Yet she had promised Germany that she would disarm, and Hitler has referred to that false promise on a thousand occasions.

And now America, far away from the present scene of trouble, is jittery—because she knows very well that if there is a big war, we will finally get into it. Some have begun to wonder whether it is safer to join the League and take the risk that goes with an active participation in world law and law-enforcement, or to drift helplessly along and take the risk that goes with the repetition of another and more terrible 1914.

As a Christmas Gift

Send UNITY to a new reader
Trial subscription of . . .

6 MONTHS for $1.00

A Journal of
Free and Critical Opinion

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

For the enclosed dollar, send UNITY as a Christmas gift, for a trial period of six months to

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Aerial Bombardment Versus Dropping of Handbills*

S. C. WU.

I have been through several aerial bombardments carried on by Japanese bombing planes over Nanchang, and know something of what an aerial bombardment is like and the consequences resulting from it. When I read the news of Chinese airplanes flying to Japan on May 19th to drop handbills and pamphlets instead of bombs, thoughts immediately came to my mind as to the significance of people's reaction to the present Sino-Japanese hostilities in both countries. Being a civilian myself, and having personally gone through the Japanese air raids, I can easily express my own feelings and the experiences I have had.

I well remember one of the Japanese aerial bombardments carried out at Nanchang last September, when the railway station of the Nanchang-Kiukiang line was bombed. From across the Kan River, which is one mile distant, I saw six Japanese bombing planes heading toward the railway station at a low altitude. It was about dark when the bombardment took place, but no lights were on in the whole city. People, especially women and children, were crowded together in dark, dingy dugouts. Dead silence prevailed as everybody held his breath when the roaring of the Japanese planes became audible. Terror-stricken mothers hugged their babes to them for protection. Nobody knew where the bombs would fall, and yet there was a feeling that the worst might come. The anxiety was tense and the ordeal was painful. Soon loud detonations were heard in rapid succession even miles away. The buildings shook and the windows rattled. Some of the glass was broken and plaster dropped from the ceiling. It sounded as though the bombs were falling on my next door neighbor's lawn, although, actually, the station was one mile away. From across the river, I saw columns of smoke and dust rising high, and also fires breaking out at several places. The station itself was intact, but most of the civilian houses around that section were a mass of ruins. Light poles were leaning in all directions with wires tangled about. Fire was raging furiously at some places. By the light from the fires, scores of people could be seen lying here and there on the ground. Some were motionless; they had been killed outright; others, mutilated beyond recognition, were groaning pitifully. There was a man breathing through a big hole in his back cut through by a piece of shrapnel. A couple of others were trying to crawl with their half-severed legs dragging behind. A lad about eight years old, with a loop of his intestines exposed, was lying on the ground gasping for breath. In another place I saw some men lifting a heavy beam from a pile of debris, because a woman had been caught under it when the building collapsed. Women were wailing; men were dumfounded. Some children were crying and running about frantically in search of their missing parents. If any one wants to see human misery at its worst, here is the place. This is what I witnessed during one of the Japanese aerial bombardments in Nanchang, and the resulting tragic scenes are vivid in my mind every time a Japanese air raid is mentioned.

And what was a Chinese air raid over Japan like on May 19th, in which only handbills and pamphlets were dropped instead of bombs? I was not there myself, so I can only imagine what it must have been like. Chinese airplanes reached Japan at about two o'clock in the morning of May 20th, according to Chinese news reports. The Japanese people were in deep slumber, and would probably have remained undisturbed, if they had not been awakened by their own alarm signal. Women and children did not need to huddle together in crowded dugouts. There was no ordeal of fateful waiting to go through. Instead of death-dealing bombs, thousands upon thousands of handbills and pamphlets fell like snow flakes, settling peacefully and noiselessly on the peaceful city. There were no explosions. Not a drop of blood was shed, nor a single life lost. Houses remained standing as before, and not a single building was destroyed. Of the various kinds of handbills and pamphlets dropped, two are translated as follows:

> No. 1—To the people of Japan:
>
> We, the members of the air force of the Chinese National Government are now flying over your country. It is not our object to destroy the lives and property of the Japanese people. Our mission is to call your attention to the atrocities and crimes which your militarists have committed in China. . . .
>
> Japanese brethren, among yourselves there have been people who are opposed to war and whose desire is for righteousness and peace. Others, deceived by the false propaganda of your militarists, are strong supporters of aggression. Whatever group you may belong to, we are sure that your press is under control, and that it will be very difficult for you to understand the true conditions of the present time. Therefore, we invite your serious attention to the following points. . . .
>
> From the *Sino-Japanese Good-will League*
>
> No. 2—Dear Japanese people,
>
> Ever since the sixth year of Showa (1931), your militarists have been preaching to you "Manchuria is Japan's life line. As soon as we get Manchuria, we shall be rich and prosperous." Now Manchuria has been occupied for seven years. During these seven years, the militarists have become high officials and have reaped a rich harvest of wealth, but what have the Japanese people got? Your taxation is increased, and the prices of commodities are mounting. Poverty, hunger, disease, and death remain unchanged.
>
> From the *people of the Republic of China.*

How the Japanese people took this kind of Chinese air raid and what their feeling toward China may have been, we have no way of knowing, but at least they should have felt relieved to see handbills instead of bombs dropping. Or they may have wondered why the Chinese planes did not drop bombs in retaliation. I hope that this questioning mood will go a long way toward making them realize the true intention of our government, and the understanding which we seek. To the Japanese militarists, this air raid with handbills probably seemed foolish. "Impossible" and "unbelievable" were the expressions used by Japanese authorities in denying any such Chinese air raid. This denial is but natural, for how could you expect them to believe it, when they are used to deliberate bombing of civilians in China. They judge the intentions of the Chinese military forces by their own brutality and wantonness. Of course, it seems to them "impossible." It is just like trying to convince a deaf mute of the beauty of music. It is too good to be true!

How do the Chinese people react, and what is their feeling toward the Japanese aerial bombardments? That I know very well, for I have been through the

*We are indebted for this article to the Kiangsi Bulletin (July, 1938), published by the Returned Students Club, Nanchang, China.—*Editors.*

Japanese air raids myself, and know exactly how I feel and how the rest of my people feel. With that feeling deep in my heart, it is my hope that our government will refrain from resorting to any aerial bombardments in Japan that would endanger the lives and property of the innocent Japanese civilians. How much the Chinese air raid mission to Japan has accomplished in the way of winning the understanding of Japanese people is difficult to estimate at present, but the wanton bombardments by Japanese planes in China have accomplished a great deal, namely, the true understanding among the masses of Chinese people of the extreme atrociousness and unprecedented brutality of the Japanese militarists.

The Study Table

War-Made Pacifists

War and the Christian. *By Charles E. Raven. New York: The Macmillan Company,* 1938.

It is an interesting commentary on the penetration of the ferment of modern problems that two chaplains of two successive kings of England, Edward VIII and George VI, have been strong pacifists. When pacifism gets as close as that to the center of the world's greatest empire, maybe it is not as weak as some of its noisy opponents would like to have us think.

Both of these chaplains became pacifists only after experience of war as army chaplains at the front in the war of 1914-18. The more famous of the two, Dick Sheppard, became Canon of St. Paul's in London, and started the Peace Pledge Union, whose present membership of about 120,000 makes it probably the largest pacifist organization in the world. The other, Charles E. Raven, Canon of Ely and Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge University, is the author of this excellent book we are now reviewing. He is one of the sponsors of that same Peace Pledge Union.

Canon Raven feels that in the problem of war the Church has at last met a moral and religious challenge which it cannot dodge, which has permeated deeply into its membership, and which may either revivify or smash it completely. In a chapter on the recent Oxford Conference he shows the depths of the split within the churches in regard to pacifism. Though the book "is intended primarily for British Christians, and has therefore dealt somewhat cursorily with the Continental and American attitude to the problem," I can assure American readers that it is of great value for us, too. See this partial list of chapter titles: "Is War Evil?", "Is War Inevitable?", "The Claims of the State," "War and the Church," "War as the Less of Two Evils," "The Renunciation of War," "Pacifism and Practical Affairs," "Is There a Middle Way?", "The Need for Full Inquiry."

As in his earlier book, *Is War Obsolete?*, we find great fairness and searching power. He strongly states the arguments and position of those Christians who, while fully admitting the evil of war, nevertheless with complete sincerity find it the less of two evils and believe that mankind is not yet able to abandon it. He makes clear the complexity of the problem and shows some of the multitudinous grays lying between the extremes of moral black and white. And then with strength and keen discrimination he makes plain the reasons for his choice of complete pacifism. Unlike G. H. C. MacGregor in his *New Testament Basis of Pacifism,* Canon Raven relies but little on exegesis of scriptural texts. Nevertheless, he treats this part of the problem as well as the theological and practical aspects. The book would be a fine corrective for easy optimists, facile humanists, and those whose moral judgments are sharply absolute—whether they are inside or outside the churches. But it is equally valuable for all other honest thinkers.

After the discussion he earnestly urges the churches and religious bodies of all kinds to meet the problem squarely, bring the opposing ideas and sentiments out fully into the open, and discuss them with tolerance and unity of spirit, in the realization that the Christian religion "is essentially concerned not with creeds or cultus or codes of conduct, but with personal relationships," and that "only in an atmosphere of fellowship can any spiritual achievement be attained." He believes that it will not do to gloss over basal issues and seek reconciliation via smooth formulae and "gestures of unity which conceal unresolved and vital divergencies." Unless this discussion is held and resolved, he fears that there may be a pacifist schism from the churches which will completely disrupt and strip them of all moral standing.

Richard B. Gregg.

Bombs Bursting in Air

Air Raids. *By John Langdon-Davies. London, England: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd.* 2 *s* 6 *d.*

When we read in the newspapers, during the recent European crisis, of the plans for protecting London from air raids by hanging a network of steel cables above the city by balloons, and its inhabitants by digging shelters in the public parks, we felt that there was something basically ridiculous in these ideas. And here is a book which says that we were right! All defensive devices against air raids today, including siren whistles and anti-aircraft artillery, are ridiculous.

When we have read in the newspaper accounts of the dreadful bombing of Spanish cities that the populations of these cities were unfrightened and undemoralized, not panicky at all but just angry, we have been full of doubts. Now comes this book to justify our doubts! These Spanish populations are driven frantic, crazy, by aerial bombardments. A city is paralyzed for hours, even days, by a few enemy planes which may, or may not, drop explosives. General Franco has only to continue his bombing to win through the sheer breakdown of Loyalist morale.

Langdon-Davies' concise and vivid book is a technical study of what happened in Barcelona on March 16th, 17th and 18th last. Accompanied by photographs and drawings, the text shows that destruction and death were terrible, but in themselves unimportant. "The interest [of the affair] lies not in the number of people that were killed, but in what happened to those left alive." What happened was in the field of psychology, but nonetheless momentous on that account.

"The results amounted to a technical revolution," which rendered obsolete upon the instant all existing defensive measures against attacks from the air, and thus introduced a new era in modern warfare.

Langdon-Davies describes in some detail the new technique developed by the Spanish Insurgents. It may be summed up in what he calls "the technique of the silent approach." A squadron of enemy planes mounts from its base high into the air—30,000 feet or more—then, heading for its objective, shuts off all motors, and, silent and also invisible, coasts swiftly to the city designated for attack, drops its bombs, and in a few seconds is off. There was no warning in Barcelona until after the bombs had fallen. By the time warnings could be sounded and the population sheltered, all the destruction had been wrought. It was an experience of unparalleled suddenness and horror.

Added to this were the bombs—a new variety of incredible explosive power, and of a sound so terrible as to overwhelm all sanity and sense. Experienced photographers found themselves running away without knowing it; veterans long under gunfire became as crazed as children. A whole population was so completely paralyzed that the processes of life just ceased. "Had the technique been used for another forty-eight hours, there would have been a total paralysis of the life of the city and of the power to resist. Indeed, it is something of a mystery why the raids were broken off when their continuance could have achieved so much. . . . Yet they very nearly won the war for the Spanish rebels."

Mr. Langdon-Davies believes that this frightful bombardment of Barcelona was an experimental maneuver. It was the testing of a new weapon of war—a deliberate attack upon the nerve-centers of non-combatants, the civil population of the enemy country! As such, it was a complete success. What was done in Barcelona could be done in London and Paris, and on an infinitely vaster scale. There is nothing to resist it. There is not a method in use anywhere to embarrass or delay this new "silent approach." "The whole conception of what must be done against bombardment has changed."

What the change is the author states in thrilling detail. He has studied the question carefully on the spot, gathered precise evidence, and is utterly frank and fearless in his discussion. His description and interpretation of what happened in Barcelona is brilliant work. Less satisfactory is his suggestion as to what to do—here obviously he is groping! But he makes perfectly plain the fearful plight of countries like England and France, and issues a terrific challenge to the war ministries to face and not evade the problem.

Incidentally, we wonder how much of what is contained in this little book explains the recent pact of Munich.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Gospels Are Valid

THE VALIDITY OF THE GOSPEL RECORD. *By Ernest Findlay Scott.* 213 *pp. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.* $2.00.

Professor Scott, the well-known New Testament scholar at Union Theological Seminary, in this well-written book wrestles with the old question of the validity of the Gospels. The book is, in reality, directed against the new school of *Formgeschichtliche Methode* which holds that the Gospels grew out of the needs and experiences of the primitive Christian Church. From the material available, a selection was made for the purpose of preaching and missionary propaganda. Dr. Scott examines this theory and is convinced that the Gospels have every claim to be accepted as a record of fact, not necessarily selections for missionary propaganda. The chief value of Professor Scott's method is his return to the sources. In this he shows his European background. Too much American scholarship is made up of reporting what others have said without minutely examining the sources. From his study of the sources Dr. Scott proves that the evidence presented in regard to Jesus would not be challenged if concerned with some other character of history. The religious value of the Gospels, he rightly maintains, cannot be separated from their historical value. He further maintains that the facts about Jesus as we have them in the Gospels are strengthened by critical analysis and interpretation of the sources. The records, it is true, and here Dr. Scott agrees with the "Form criticism," are the outcome of a long process. This process, he goes on to show, does not, however, mean that the Gospels were composed to explain the existence of the early Christian community, or to support its message. This book deserves a wide reading by those who have studied, even remotely, the criticism of the Gospels during the last few years.

C. A. HAWLEY.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 82)

ities of ancient times appear crude. Imperfect as the average human being is today, his ethics are superior to those once considered divine. Principles derived from facts excel those based upon credulous misconceptions.

Evolutionists have faith in Progress—sufficient faith to follow wherever it may lead—but they realize that the Vital Force is not omniscient, almighty or all-loving. The antediluvian monsters were errors in creation and have become extinct; the "Acts of God"—earthquakes, lightning, hurricanes, typhoons, tornadoes, floods, drought—afflict man regardless of his prayers. The world, with its inevitable pain and disease, is not the perfect creation of an all-wise Providence.

Man, the supreme sentient being, is a frail creature but can make his life far happier than it is by facing the facts and by developing methods of overcoming difficulties. The marvels of science exceed in wonder the miracles of old. The voice of the radio is more helpful than the voice of Jehovah in the burning bush; the avoidance of disease by scientific methods is more beneficial than the healing powers of any individual; the extension of man's life-span assures him a longer life than ever before.

Evolutionists do not pray to the Vital Force for rain, or for safety on the seas, because experience has shown that such prayers are not answered. They have not discovered anything about life after death so are concerned chiefly with making life happier on earth. They hope to make this a better world. The future of the human race is more vital than personal immortality.

In formulating their philosophy, Evolutionists ignore all alleged incidents of the past not confirmed beyond reasonable doubt. They refuse to accept ancient scriptures as authoritative because the authors, supposedly inspired, knew so little of the divine plan. Revelation has not been completed.

Evolutionists gladly accept every worthy principle found in sacred scriptures, every religious doctrine that has been proved sound, but they do not look for guidance to any divinities whose existence depends upon ancient manuscripts and is not demonstrable today.

Evolutionists endeavor to lead righteous lives. For them right action is determined by adjustment to the laws

(*Continued on page* 96)

Correspondence

A Correction

Editor of UNITY:

I have been reading in UNITY your very interesting "Episodes of Travel," and think that the printers must have made some serious mistake. You will recall the fellow who told the guide that there were eleven million Jews in America. Then in parentheses, you said "I wondered what he would think if I told him that the number was over fourteen millions."

Being myself deeply interested in the Jewish problem, with many, many loyal Jewish friends, and having been told so many times in the past of the large number of Jews in the world, I wrote to Washington for the latest figures and also consulted the *World Almanac*, and talked over the telephone with the Editor of the *Jewish Advocate* here in Boston; and the nearest figures that conformed to the actual facts are that there are between fifteen and sixteen million Jews in the whole world, and between four and five millions in this country. So, I wondered whether something was left out by the printer in your story, and that perhaps you had meant to say "I wondered what he would think if I had told him that there were only something over fourteen millions in the entire world." Am I wrong in my reading of that paragraph?

The "Episodes" were all very interesting. I was particularly interested in the "Reader in the Railway Carriage," "The Typical American," and the girl who was so thoroughly modern and yet at heart as old as time.

FRANCIS H. ROWLEY.

Boston, Massachusetts.

Note: Dr. Rowley is correct. Our statement was one of those occasional "slips" which are so unaccountable. We are grateful to Dr. Rowley for writing us.—*Editor.*

Jewish Refugees

Editor of UNITY:

When a city is wiped out by fire or flood, the neighboring towns take in the refugees, even at much inconvenience. The Jews in Germany and Austria have been overtaken by a calamity worse than fire or flood. It is caused by the wickedness of men, not by the wrath of nature. The calamity is on a gigantic scale. All countries ought now to modify their immigration laws, to give shelter to the refugees. In great emergencies, ordinary rules should yield to humanity.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The War Crisis in England

[An excerpt from a private letter to the Editor]

"The strain we have been living under during the last six weeks is inexpressible. The slump in business a fortnight before the last event was such that a businessman said to me: 'The month of September has cost Great Britain more than a war,' and many hoped for a war as the only means of clearing the close atmosphere. In 1914 war was declared all of a sudden; this time everybody's nerves were strung to the breaking-point, and though the English were comparatively quiet, most London schools were already evacuated, the children and very many parents were taken to the country, all households were provided with gas masks, and those who did not intend to leave London were shown how to make one room in their house gasproof. People were working at it feverishly day and night. The pictures of the National Gallery were taken to the Tube Stations, and the fear of air raids was the only topic. When we heard that Chamberlain was flying to Munich, we cried with relief. We felt that it was well worth while to pay any price for peace, however deeply one must feel ashamed to sacrifice the Czech people for the sake of peace. But somehow one cannot fully believe in Germany's good will. After some days of public rejoicing, people have become very suspicious and pessimistic, and think that war which seems to be unavoidable is only postponed—perhaps till next spring. But the imminent danger is over, thank God, and from the fear of a threatening war, we turn again to the charity work which we are doing for the Austrian Refugees, especially the children."

London, England. M. H.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 95)

of the Vital Force rather than by attempting to follow ancient commands and teachings so obscure that they lead devotees to diametrically opposite courses of action whenever applied to modern problems.

There is one universal law for all people regardless of racial or religious differences. Everyone is entitled to all knowledge available for promotion of health and prosperity. To that end there must be democracy with complete freedom of speech. Truth is the only criterion for censorship.

It is not necessary to abandon spirituality when shifting from Religion to Philosophy as a guiding principle. The Vital Force may be envisioned as Spirit. Following its laws produces the Spirit of Progress which is superior to any spirituality based upon misconception of the universe.

If devotional exercises are desired, substitute Truth for Christ and the same inspirational benefit will be obtained as from Christianity. Truth saves. Truth is our guide. Truth lives within us, et cetera.

Evolutionists find a world in which, despite its hardships, there is beauty, music, love and joy; a world where good will toward their fellow men brings its reward. They cultivate integrity, justice, altruism, and the honorable fulfillment of obligations. They have discovered that the greater the understanding of life, the greater the possibility of happiness. They endeavor to be consistent. Above all they worship Truth.

—*The Arbitrator.*

Peace without Violence

Peace workers today face difficult decisions. Is collective action the greatest good even if it involves military committments? Are we party to an aggression if we refuse to use force to suppress it? How shall we meet urgent questions of international and domestic injustice?

The U. S. section of the Women's International League has adopted (October 1937) the following statement to reiterate its fundamental conviction:

"In this period of conflict and injustice the National Board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom reaffirms its belief that even flagrant injustice does not justify recourse to violence, inasmuch as the use of violence inevitably transforms those who employ it, and sows the seed of hatred, intolerance, and oppression.

"The recognition of this principle imposes upon us all the urgent obligation:

to be alert for cases of injustice;
to seek for underlying causes; and
to give active support to movements which make for social change through *peaceful means.*"

An early statement, first issued in 1920, by the International Executive Committee of the Women's International League at Geneva is here repeated, since it always has been and still is the basis of our work:

"The League is made up of people who believe that we are not obliged to choose between violence and passive acceptance of unjust conditions for ourselves or others; who believe, on the contrary, that courage, determination, moral power, generous indignation, active goodwill, can achieve their ends without violence.

"We believe that experience condemns force as a self-defeating weapon although men are still so disposed to turn to it in education, in dealing with crime, in effecting or preventing social changes, and above all in carrying out national policies.

"We believe that new methods, free from violence, must be worked out for ending abuses and for undoing wrongs, as well as for achieving positive ends."

—*Bulletin of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.*